

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated April 21, 2005, claims 1, 4, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18 and 19 have been amended. Claims 1-20 remain in the case. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-14 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motai (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,220) in view of Elsey et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0055351). The Office Action rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motai (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,220) in view of Elsey et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0055351), further in view of Bixler (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,351) and further in view of Davis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,937,160).

The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the amendments to the claims that more clearly defines the Applicants' invention and the arguments below.

Namely, none of the cited references, in combination or alone, contain the Applicant's "...enabling accessors of the computer display to have access during inactive mode to electronic access numbers and methods of time dependant contact information associated with the preferred reasons of contact of the user."

In contrast, Motai discloses "[A]n image display apparatus...which a graphic image...and a calendar are displayed on a display unit..." (see Abstract of Motai), while Elsey et al. disclose calendar and personalized information and communication services over a wireless mobile device (see Abstract of Elsey et al.), and Bixler discloses the "...[D]isplayed information is updated at pre-selected intervals..." (see Abstract of Bixler), the combined references are clearly missing the Applicant's claimed enabling accessors access to electronic access numbers and methods of time dependant contact information associated with the preferred reasons of contact.

Specifically, enabling accessors access to electronic access numbers and methods of time dependant contact information associated with the preferred reasons of contact allows the user to be contacted at all times for any pre-defined reason, such as in cases of emergencies. For example, the user could have a column for an emergency contact method as a certain cell phone number from 8:00 AM to 12:00 PM, then a pager number after 12:00 PM. The next column could be for business reasons and a business contact telephone number during specified hours, a business pager or cell phone

number for any other reason for other time periods, or an e-mail address for other reasons and other time periods.

Thus, since the combined references do not teach, disclose or suggest allowing remote users access to electronic access numbers and methods of time dependant contact information associated with the preferred reasons of contact, they cannot render the claims obvious and the Applicant submits that these rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Last, with regard to the dependent claims, because they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, and they contain additional limitations that are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, these claims are also considered to be patentable (MPEP § 2143.03).

Thus, it is respectfully requested that all of the claims be allowed based on the amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant kindly invites the Examiner to **telephone** the Applicant's attorney at **(818) 885-1575** if the Examiner has any questions or concerns. Please note that all correspondence should continue to be directed to:

Hewlett Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,
Dated: July 21, 2005



Edmond A. DeFrank
Reg. No. 37,814
Attorney for Applicant
(818) 885-1575 TEL
(818) 885-5750 FAX